

REMARKS

In this paper, claim 1 is currently amended. After entry of the above amendment, claims 1-20 are pending.

Claims 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed. The frame recited in claims 3 and 5 is not part of the derailleur but is a clarification of the environment in which the derailleur is used. Also, reciting an element dimensioned to accommodate that environment is not indefinite. *Orthokinetics Inc. v. Safety Travel Chars Inc.* 1 USPQ.2d 1081 (Fed.Cir. 1986).

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Juy (US 3,111,855). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that a portion of the base member overlaps the threaded member when viewed perpendicular to the threaded shaft. Juy discloses a derailleur wherein a support yoke (3) is mounted to a support lug (1) by a nut (9) and bolt (7). Insofar as support lug (1) is interpreted to be the base member and nut (9) is interpreted to be the threaded member recited in the claims, no part of the base member (1) overlaps the threaded member (9) when viewed perpendicular to the threaded shaft at (2) that mounts the derailleur to the bicycle frame.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §112 have been overcome by the foregoing amendment and remarks, and it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Deland
Reg. No. 31,242

DELAND LAW OFFICE
P.O. Box 69
Klamath River, California 96050
(530) 465-2430